



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/701,710	12/01/2000	Volker Schreiner	Beiersdorf 688-VMM	7950

7590 03/18/2003

Norris McLaughlin & Marcus P.A.
220 East 42nd street
30th Floor
New York, NY 10017

EXAMINER

WELLS, LAUREN Q

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1617

DATE MAILED: 03/18/2003

15

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application N .

09/701,710

Applicant(s)

SCHREINER ET AL.

Examiner

Lauren Q Wells

Art Unit

1617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 January 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 5-12 and 27-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 5-12 and 27-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 5-12 and 27-31 are pending. The Amendment filed 2/4/03, Paper No. 14, amended claims 5-12 and added claims 27-31.

The petition granted on 1/3/03, Paper No. 13, withdrew the Finality of the Office Action mailed 10/9/02, Paper No. 11.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the 35 USC 103 rejection over claims 5-12, 27-31 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. However, to the extent that the arguments may be relevant to the instant rejection, the Examiner will address them.

The Amendment and arguments filed 1/9/03, Paper No. 14, are sufficient to overcome the 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph and 35 USC 112, 1st paragraph rejection over the scope of enablement rejection and the phrase "strengthening the lipid barrier".

The objection to the specification in the Office Action mailed 10/9/02, Paper No. 11, is maintained.

Applicant's arguments are persuasive to overcome the objection to the IDS in the Office Action mailed 10/9/02, Paper No. 11.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Art Unit: 1617,

Claims 5-12, 27-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The phrase “increasing the synthesis rate of ceramides of human skin” in claims 5-12 and 27-31 is new and was not part of the original disclosure.

Applicant argues, “it is presumed that the examiner also reviewed page 5, fourth line from the bottom through page 6, line 3”. While the Examiner has reviewed this citation, it is respectfully pointed out that there is no recitation of “increasing the synthesis rate of ceramides of human skin”. The Examiner furthermore respectfully points out that she is aware that sphingolipids are lipids containing sphingosine.

The remainder of Applicant’s arguments are directed to “lack of written description”. However, this rejection is a “new matter” rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 5-12, 27-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Znaiden et al. (5,523,090).

Znaiden et al. teach skin treatment compositions for improving skin strength and firmness and reducing the signs of cellulite. Exemplified is a composition comprising alpha-hydroxy acids (lactic acid, malic acid, phytic acid), 0.5% green tea extract, 0.2% carnitine, and 0.1%

Art Unit: 1617

epicatechin. In Col. 2, lines 13-20, it is disclosed that alpha hydroxy acids improve the appearance of dry, flaky, wrinkles, aged, photodamaged skin, and other conditions. See abstract; Col. 13, lines 46-Col. 14, line 35. Thus, Znaiden et al. and the instant invention both teach a method of treating dry skin comprising applying to the skin a composition comprising 0.001-10% epicatechin.

Regarding the limitations of increasing the synthesis rate of ceramides, stimulating sphingolipid synthesis, strengthening the lipid barrier of the skin, it is respectfully pointed out that the instant claims are directed to a method of applying to the skin a composition comprising 0.001-10% of a catechin, a gallic ester of a catechin, or mixtures thereof. Any properties exhibited by or benefits provided the composition are inherent and are not given patentable weight over the prior art. A chemical composition and its properties are inseparable. Therefore, if the prior art teaches the identical chemical structure, the properties Applicant discloses and/or claims are necessarily present. In re Spada, 911 F.2d 705, 709, 15 USPQ 1655, 1658 (Fed. Cir. 1990). See MPEP 2112.01. The burden is shifted to Applicant to show that the prior art product does not inherently possess the same properties as instantly claimed product. The prior art teaches application to the skin of compositions containing the same components as instantly claimed, which would inherently increase the synthesis rate of ceramides, stimulate sphingolipid synthesis, and strengthen the lipid barrier of the skin, instantly claimed. Applicant has not provided any evidence of record to show that the prior art compositions do not exhibit the same properties as instantly claimed.

The Examiner respectfully points out instant claims 9-11 are product-by-process claims. Even though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination

Art Unit: 1617

of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process. In re Thorpe, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985). See MPEP 2113.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lauren Q Wells whose telephone number is (703) 305-1878. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7-5:30), with alternate Mondays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreeni Padmanabhan can be reached on (703)305-1877. The fax phone numbers for

Art Unit: 1617

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for regular communications and (703) 872-9307 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1234.

lqw
March 17, 2003



SREENI PADMANABHAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

3/17/03